

REMARKS

The Official Action of February 23, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-13, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification and rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended the specification and the claims to eliminate each of the problems in the specification identified by the Examiner, with the exception of claim 8, as no "holes" are set out in that claim, and in claim 10 in that the "hole" set out therein is directed to hole (33) in crankpin (28) as shown in Fig. 10. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 have now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cunningham '289. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection especially as applied to independent claim 1 as amended.

The amendments made to claim 1 clearly establish that the jaws are directly connected to centering means and a positioner operably connected between at least one of the jaws and actuator means so that movement of the positioner engaged to the at least one jaw simultaneously moves the remaining jaws.

In comparison, in Cunningham, each jaw is engaged to a positioner which is engaged to both a centering means and an actuator means. In this arrangement, to move the working portion of the Cunningham jaws relative to its central axis, it is necessary to separately operate each jaw relative to its position. Clearly, the arrangement of the invention, according to amended claim 1, permits a faster and easier way to vary the working position of the jaws.

Applicant respectfully submits that Cunningham does not disclose the essential features of amended claim 1 nor suggest or give any hint of the features of the invention set out therein. Accordingly, the claimed invention clearly patentably defines over Cunningham.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

Appln. No. 10/698,359  
Amdt. dated May 18, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\bn\c\corr\corgi17\pto\Amendment-A.doc